REMARKS

I. The 35 U.S.C. §103 Rejections

Claims 1-4 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,229,553 B1 issued to Duluk, Jr. et al. ("DULUK") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,408,605 issued to Deering ("DEERING")

Independent claims 1 and 3 have been amended to recite an additional element of "defining a packet type corresponding to a setup variable type." This element has support on at least page 7, lines 4-14, of the Specification. Neither DULUK nor DEERING discloses or suggests the added element. Therefore, all pending claims should now be in condition for allowance.²

II. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone interview would help advance the prosecution of this case, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

By:

Roxana H. Yang

Registration No. 46,788

PATENTESQUE LAW GROUP, LLP P.O. Box 400 Los Altos, CA 94023 (650) 948-0822

¹ The exemplary embodiments described in the Specification are merely illustrative. Therefore, the scope of the claims should not be construed to include only the exemplary embodiments described.

 $^{^{2}}$ See arguments submitted in the Responses filed on January 21, 2003, and July 2, 2003.